

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 23 and 24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8-10, 17 and 18 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 are withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101396 to Huston et al. ("Huston") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,808,594 to Tsuboyama et al. ("Tsuboyama"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,765,549 to Yamazaki et al. ("Yamazaki"); rejects claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Huston in view of Tsuboyama and Yamazaki, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,357,583 to Sato et al. ("Sato"); and rejects claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Huston in view of Tsuboyama and Yamazaki, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,037 to Alt et al. ("Alt"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Huston does not teach or suggest a display device, a driving method and an electro-optical device including "each of the pixels being disposed at separate intersections of scanning lines and signal lines, each of the pixels including at least two of the sub-pixels, and the static random access memory of the at least two sub-pixels of each of the pixels being connected to the same scanning line," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 8-10, 17 and 18.

The Office Action asserts that Huston teaches a display device, an electro-optical device and a driving method including a plurality of pixels each having a plurality of sub-pixels in which each sub-pixel is provided with a static random access memory and a switching transistor, and a data signal being supplied to the static random access memory through the switching transistor. Notwithstanding these assertions, Huston does not teach or

suggest the static random access memory of at least two sub-pixels of each of the pixels being connected to the same scanning line, as set forth in independent claims 1, 8-10, 17 and 18.

The display device, the driving method and the electro-optical device of claims 1, 8-10, 17 and 18 include static random access memories (SRAMs) 41, 42 of two sub-pixels of a same pixel that may be disposed such that they are connected to a signal line 2 via transistors 3 having gates that are connected to a scanning line 1 that defines the pixel. See Figs. 1 and 3, and paragraph [0045] of the specification. Because the SRAMs 41, 42 of the two sub-pixels of the same pixel share a common scanning line 1, it is unnecessary to provide a number of scanning lines according to a number of sub-pixels in each pixel. See paragraph [0045] of the specification. Accordingly, any undesirable writing capacitance generated between wiring patterns may be reduced, thereby preventing a delay caused when data is rewritten. Further, light emission efficiency may be enhanced with a smaller number of transistors and wiring patterns. See paragraph [0045] of the specification. Neither Huston, Tsuboyama, Yamazaki, Sato nor Alt teaches or suggests such features, or provides such advantages.

Huston teaches a display matrix 12 including a plurality of display elements 14. See Fig. 1. Each display element 14 includes a pixel 16 and a display circuit 18 having a plurality of memory cells 20A, 20B or more than one memory cell per pixel. See Fig. 2 and page 5, paragraphs [0082] and [0084], and page 6, paragraph [0087]. However, Huston does not teach that the memory cells 20A, 20B each pixel 16 are connected to a same scanning line. Therefore, Huston does not teach or suggest the display device, the driving method and the electro-optical device of claims 1, 8-10, 17 and 18.

The Office Action asserts that Tsuboyama, Yamazaki, Sato and Alt remedy the deficiencies of Huston. However, Tsuboyama, Yamazaki, Sato and Alt do not remedy the deficiencies of Huston for the reasons discussed below.

Tsuboyama teaches a driving method and a liquid crystal display device 1 including pixels each having a plurality of sub-pixels S having mutually different areas inclusive of larger pixels and smaller pixels. See Abstract, and Figs. 1A-1C and 4. Tsuboyama does not teach or suggest that each sub-pixel S includes a static random access memory. Therefore, Tsuboyama cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest static random access memories of each of the sub-pixels S being connected to a same scanning line.

Yamazaki teaches an active matrix display including a pixel portion 101 that includes a plurality of pixels 104 disposed at separate intersections of gate signal lines G1-Gy and source signal lines 107, i.e., data signal lines. See Figs. 2 and 3. Each pixel 104 includes an SRAM 108 connected to the source signal line 107 via a switching TFT 105 and connected to a gate signal line 106. See Fig. 3, and col. 8, line 58 - col. 9, line 9. Yamazaki does not teach or suggest that each pixel 104 includes at least two sub-pixels each having an SRAM 108. Therefore, Yamazaki cannot be reasonably considered to teach or suggest SRAMs of at least two sub-pixels of each pixel being connected to a same scanning line.

Sato is directed to a graphics processing apparatus and method including a color laser printer 500 that includes a constant current generator 555 having a transistor 560. See Figs. 2 and 11, and col. 11, lines 42-44. Alt teaches a TFT LCD active data line repair system and method including an array portion 20 with pixels and/or sub-pixels, and thin-film transistors located at intersections of every data line 22 and gate line 26 to drive the pixel or sub-pixel of the array 20. See Fig. 1, and col. 1, lines 44-47. However, neither Sato nor Alt teach or suggest each sub-pixel including a static random access memory connected to a same scanning line.

Because neither Tsuboyama, Yamazaki, Sato nor Alt teach or suggest sub-pixels, each including a static random access memory connected to a same scanning line, Huston,

Tsuboyama, Yamazaki, Sato and Alt do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the display device, the driving method or the electro-optical device of claims 1, 8-10, 17 and 18.

Therefore, claims 1, 8-10, 17 and 18 are not rendered obvious by Huston, Tsuboyama, Yamazaki, Sato and Alt, alone or in combination. Claims 2-7, 11-16, 19, 20, 23 and 24 variously depend from claims 1 and 10, and thus are also not rendered obvious by Huston, Tsuboyama, Yamazaki, Sato and Alt for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

Claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 variously depend from claims 1 and 10. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 be rejoined upon allowance of claims 1 and 10.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20, 23 and 24.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/ale

Date: June 10, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--